

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 6 are rejected under §103(a) as unpatentable over Rebholz in view of Bengtsson et al and Badische. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, and its dependent claims 2 and 6, are directed to a method and require, among other things, the following steps:

laminating the aluminum foil on the adhesive resin coated surface of the innermost film through application of an adhesive for dry laminations, or an anchor coat agent;

aging and keeping a reel after reel-rolling up a web shape laminate obtained by laminating the aluminum foil,

unwinding the laminate from the reel and processing the aluminum foil surface by corona discharge....

(emphasis added)

Applicants' specification identifies the aging and keeping step as a point of novelty and non-obviousness over the prior art. For example, at page 5 of the specification applicants state that the objects of the invention and the deficiencies of the prior art are met and overcome by a method of manufacturing incorporating, among other things, "(c) a step of keeping a laminate for aging of the laminate, after rolling round the web shape laminate obtained by the lamination of aluminum foil to a reel shape, (d) a step of processing the aluminum foil surface by corona discharge, after unwinding the laminate from the kept reel...."

At page 6, applicants state that a preferable embodiment of the method involves keeping the reel shape laminate for aging of 48-72 hours at a temperature of 15-30 degrees C. At page 10, applicants further describe the particulars and advantages of the aging step.

The cited references refer to continuous processes. Neither Rebholz, Bengtsson, or Badische describe or suggest incorporating a step disrupting that continuity. The rejection fails to identify within the cited references a step of “aging and keeping a reel after reel rolling up a web shape laminate obtained by laminating the aluminum foil.” Nor has the Official Action identified any suggestion within any of those references motivating one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate such a step.

The Official Action fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1, 2 and 6. The rejection fails to identify any teaching or suggestion to introduce an aging step in an otherwise continuous process. Without such teaching or suggestion, this step of the claimed invention is not rendered obvious, and therefore the claimed methods cannot be considered obvious.

The same holds true for claims 3 and 4. Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on claim 1, but are separately rejected with claims 7-12 and 14-16, over the same references. Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 3 and 4 because the rejection fails identify any suggestion of the aging and keeping step. Again, the cited references describe continuous processes, and there is no suggestion of any advantage in disrupting the continuity of the process as by an aging step.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 7-12 and 14-16 under §103(a) over Rebholz, Bengtsson, and Badische for substantially the same reasons. As above, the cited references do not disclose the collection of the laminate following application of the aluminum foil by reel-rolling up a web shape laminate.

Specifically, the rejection does not show that any of the cited references teach or suggest a step of “rolling onto a reel a web shape laminate obtained after laminating the aluminum foil on the adhesive resin coated surface of the innermost

film; unwinding the laminate from the reel; and processing a surface of the aluminum foil after unwinding by corona discharge....” For example, in the Bengtsson method, the stream of the laminate is continuous over the whole process. See, Figures 1, 2, 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D. Further, Rebholz discloses conventional laminating means. See, column 3, lines 23-29. It does not disclose the discontinuous lamination method having the aging step of the present invention.

Further, claims 14-16 are dependent on claim 7 and expressly recite that the laminate is kept on the reel for a specified period of time and/or at a specified temperature. As discussed above, the cited references do not provide any teaching or suggestion of an aging step, much less one involving the specified parameters of aging duration and temperature. Accordingly, those claims are not suggested by the cited references.

Claim 13 is not included in any of the detailed statements of rejection. Notwithstanding, the cover sheet of the Official Action indicates that all claims 1-16 are rejected. Applicants request clarification as to whether claim 13 stands rejected, and, if so, on what basis.

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Formal notification to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner perceives any impediments to formal notification of allowance, applicants request that the Examiner contact their representative at the number provided below. Such informal communication will expedite examination and disposition of the case.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: February 22, 2005

By:

  
Brian P. O'Shaughnessy  
Registration No. 32,747

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620